



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

H.A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,687	08/25/2003	Robert Sigurd Nelson		3778

7590 04/18/2007
ROBERT SIGURD NELSON
2922 Upshur Street
San Diego, CA 92106

EXAMINER

SUNG, CHRISTINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2884

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/648,687	NELSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christine Sung	2884

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12,13,16,18-21 and 24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12,16,18-21 and 24 is/are allowed..

6) Claim(s) 13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on January 16, 2007 has been accepted and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerstenmayer (WO 00/63723) in view of Nygren (US Patent 5,434,417).

Regarding claim 13, Nygren discloses a coarse Compton collimator (figure 5, element 66) wherein a radiation shield covers alternate edge on detectors in order to limit their direct exposure from the radiation source. Nygren discloses that the collimator can be configured to be adapted to a number of configuration (See column 8, lines 28-51). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use a collimator that covered every alternate edge on detector so as to increase the detection efficiency by increasing the amount of radiation the detector is exposed to.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12, 16, 18-21 and 24 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 1-2, 5-10, 12, 16, 18-20 and 24, none of the prior art of record specifies an enhanced Compton gamma camera, namely the combination of elements such that the edge on detector detects electronically determined interaction height, along with the other claimed

Art Unit: 2884

elements. Prior art references disclose determining the position of the event by using columnar scintillation elements or using semiconductor-edge-on type of detectors, and disclose determining the position of the interaction by determining spatially where the interaction occurred then back projecting to determine where the event occurred. However, none of the prior art of record specifies a detector that calculates where the exact height within a column or a particular edge on detector of where the interaction occurred, but rather uses conventional back-projection/cone techniques to determine the positioning of the event.

Regarding claim 21, none of the prior art of record specifies or makes obvious a method of increasing the spatial and energy resolution of an edge-on radiation detector, namely the combination of steps of to determine the interaction location and energy of a detected event by irradiating the edge on detector to measure the signal strength vs. interaction location in the direction of the aperture height to develop a calibration table, along with the other claimed steps. As stated above, conventional prior art references determine event location by back projecting from the cell in which the interaction occurred, whether it is in a scintillation cell or in a semiconductor edge on cell. However such detection does not disclose determining the exact interaction height within the detector itself, but rather estimates the event position by using, for example, a larger cone of back-projection.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on January 16, 2007 regarding claim 13 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. Regarding claim 13, Applicant's arguments are not sufficient to overcome the rejection. Applicant seems to argue that there is no benefit to combining the Gerstenmayer and Nygren references. However, such motivation to combine exists (see above paragraphs).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine Sung whose telephone number is 571-272-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 9-5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on 571-272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christine Sung
Examiner
Art Unit 2884

CS



DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800